Mission Bay Landfill
Technical Advisory Committee
City Administration Building
12th Floor Conference Room B
November 18, 2005
10:00am to 12:00pm

Meeting Minutes

TAC Members Present

Donna Frye	Rebecca Lafreniere	Jeoffry Gordon, MD
Judy Swink	David Huntley Ph.D.	Robert Curtis
Barry Pulver	Brian McDaniel	

TAC Members Absent

Bruce Reznik	Robert Tukey Ph.D.	David Kennedy, DDS
John Wilks	Frank Gormlie	Ben Leaf

Interested Parties/Alternates

Scott Andrews	Kathleen Blavatt	John Fields
George Murphy	Susan Orlofsky	Bob Gutzler
Wayne Williams	Hiram Sarabia	Jace Miller
		Daniel Beeman

Staff

Steven Fontana	Ray Purtee	Julie Teel
Chris Gonaver	Sylvia Castillo	

The meeting was called to order by Councilmember Frye. Self introductions were made. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes

October meeting minutes were reviewed and approved with no changes.

Public Comment

Dr. Gordon asked what will be the process followed- review comments this meeting and the next? When are we going to see revisions to the report? Council member Frye said that SCS planned to gather all comments, and then present an updated draft report.

Hiram Sarabia stated he had comments. Councilmember Frye thanked TAC members for donating their time to this effort and said we would like to get everyone's written comments by the end of the calendar year.

Scott Andrews felt it is unusual to review a $650k study that doesn't have an executive summary. David Lester of Environmental Health and Justice has reviewed over 200 similar reports and only once or twice has there been no executive summary. Councilmember Frye responded that his was discussed at the last meeting and hopefully we can have an executive summary by the December meeting.

Site Assessment Report Comment Review

Review began with Barry Pulver's comments: Where did the chemical wastes go?

Delineating landfill limits is necessary when planning near development, because there are limits to new development near landfills. Why are limits of landfill in the draft report the same as in this report-i.e. no change as a result of the investigation?

In Section 1-list names of investigators, show off their qualifications.

In Section 2-you show a revised site conceptual model, but how was it revised? Define type of wells- groundwater, gas, etc.

In Section 4 data quality objectives (DQO's) were discussed, but it was never clear if they were prepared; if so, they should be in an appendix.

Councilmember Frye asked that we concentrate on comments that merit further discussion; and are they part of the original scope of work? Or beyond the scope of work? Barry Pulver felt that the responses to comments are part of preparing a defensible report. Councilmember Frye stated she wants to be sure that responses to every comment are made. Chris Gonaver felt that a summary of responses could be annotated such as "see page 256 of the text" or "would have to be part of a follow up study."

Councilmember Frye stated we should have an executive summary out before the next meeting. We should have responses to comments from SCS by when? Chris responded that if all comments are due by 12/31 then SCS would probably need another month after that to get responses back.

Barry decided to skip reviewing comments that were only technical edits and to use his discretion to select comments more open to debate.

On page 70, groundwater sampling of wells, multiple water bearing zones are evident so additional samples should be taken.

A comment was made that there's only one statistical sampling point and therefore the new wells should be resampled multiple times. Ray Purtee stated that sampling new wells under the City's existing program would require a modification to the Waste Discharge Requirement's Monitoring and Reporting Plan. The existing well network is currently sampled to comply with State Title 27 requirements.

Barry felt that new samples should be pulled from higher salinity zones in the existing wells and then the risk assessment could be re-run with the new data if necessary. He continued his comment review with the 1st paragraph of page 108, investigations of the bay are on-going for fecal coliform contamination from coots. There was discussion concerning what study on DNA was being referred to; SCS should reference this report.

A comment was made that Mission Bay is surrounded by 50 year old sewer pipes in fill material and any study on coliform needs to take this into account. Councilmember Frye related an incident of running a camera thru a sewer pipe to find a leak.

Chris Gonaver stated there is intermittent contamination of the bay by coliform and the study was done to determine where the coliform was coming from. We will find this report and make it available.

Barry continued his comment review with Page 5, section 18, regardless of where the arsenic comes from, the City as property owner needs to take actions concerning high arsenic levels. Since it's naturally occurring and the State won't require cleanup, the City should take some action. The precautionary principle says to take action on proposed legislation, similar to that taken for naturally occurring asbestos.

Councilmember Frye said that the TAC needs to think about how exactly will this report be presented, or would this committee present a report on it's own for issues like this?

Chris felt that naturally occurring arsenic is a perfect issue for the EPA to address.

Wayne Williams feels that the way the document refers to arsenic in all soils needs to be more specific- where and what soils? Blanket referral is a bad policy.

Barry said that a normal risk assessment would have dropped a background level of arsenic, but we kept it in. Councilmember Frye reminded the group that another conservative assumption of the risk assessment was a baby swimming in groundwater under the landfill.

Scott Andrews stated that arsenic is at a risk level of 5 and mercury is at 2, and since this area is a park and the City encourages public uses, blowing dust is an issue.

Hiram Sarabia pointed out that Figure 4 shows where arsenic levels are above background, e.g. mb#24 arsenic level is 144 mg/kg which is much above the background level.

Barry said that metals are not that soluble in water; dermal contact or ingestion are the only pathways of exposure. Minimize exposure by minimizing contact such as having three feet of cover over soils with high metals.

Scott Andrews pointed out that landfill soils have thallium, so the past 15 years of exposure to thallium is an issue. He will get Barry data on thallium levels.

There was a concern that the bay to bay link is still being proposed. Councilmember Frye said that it's a dead project.

Barry closed his comment review by letting SCS know to contact him if they need clarification.

Hiram Sarabia's comments were reviewed next. Hiram started off by saying he's more concerned that the report be presented as it is- limitations and good points too. To save time he only went over those comments that are discussion items.

Comment #1: these historical doc's should be included in report. Comments #2, 3 & 4- these may already be in an appendix.

Comment #5- he would like to see the criteria explained. Comment #6- a lot of people are going to want a reasonable explanation as to why a quality assurance plan (QAP) is not present. A sample for hex chromium exceeded its holding time. This is an example of what a QAP would show.

Comment #10– there are other more sensitive methods; why did we use the ones we used?

Comment #11- didn't get a sense of how sediment samples were collected.

Comment #12- need a calibration record for field instruments.

Comment #13 gives us a sense of how representative the sampling was.

Comment #14 tells us how many samples you need to collect to get a representation.

Comment #16- nice to see contour maps for metals.

Suggestion for future studies come from suggestions in the report and TAC.

An inherent limitation of what was done here is looking at individual compounds and ignoring their cumulative effect. This limitation should be called out in the report.

Public Comment

Dr. Gordon remarked that he reviewed the Mission Bay landfill documents on the District 6 website and was impressed by the amount of pertinent documentation available.
[Address is http://www.sandiego.gov/citycouncil/cd6/crtk/mblandfill.shtml]

Councilmember Frye asked the group if the letter and comments from Chuck Budinger need to be discussed? The consensus was that his letter was adequately addressed at the last meeting.

Councilmember Frye asked the group if it was their sense to finish this comment review phase by the end of the year? Answer was affirmative.

Comment was made concerning historical data that shows levels of toxics at 20-30 feet depths and did we re-sample at these depths? There should be easy access to historical documents on waste dumping. And will SCS be able to respond to the question "where did these chemicals go?" Dr. Gordon responded we shouldn't be asking SCS to fixate on where these went, but rather what is present today. Dr. Huntly said there's a disconnect between the mass of chemicals that went in and what we've found in our own study. For example the Stringfellow site has plumes at 2-3 orders of magnitude higher results than we found at Mission Bay. Is this because the environment at Mission Bay is different and degraded the chemicals? Or that the specific

contaminated areas were not sampled? Or these chemicals weren't dumped there? He expects that SCS could at least omit some of these scenarios if they do not answer the question in full.

A question was asked "Are there documents available concerning the landfill that are not on the website?" Chris Gonaver responded yes, there are many more in the City's files.

South Shores Development in the Master Plan

Given the time constraints, Judy Swink limited her discussion on the South Shores Master Plan. How many people have visited the district 6 website? Posted are excerpts from the Mission Bay Park Master Plan that concern the South Shores area. On page 108 of the SCS report, in the discussion on on-going coliform pollution, is the statement "an improvement of water circulation within the Bay would be beneficial to water quality." There have been many such studies over the years, but they show that the "dead spot" would only be moved to an area in front of the Hilton hotel. Karen Henry of the City almost had funding to mechanically move water across the Fiesta Island entrance way, and expose it to sunlight, except that the funding agency withdrew the funding due to feasibility. Solutions that appear to be practical are improvements at the mouths of the creeks or upstream that restore natural filtration. Such a simple statement in the SCS report concerning improving circulation within the bay should be removed. This is in the first paragraph of page 108. The alternative would be to try and list every study ever done on circulation and coliform pollution in the bay.

In closing, Judy reminded the group that the City's Park & Recreation Department is starting to fund the master plan improvements for South Shores with Fiesta Island first.

A question was asked, does the Merkle report show differences in the maps, such as the least tern preserve area vs. what the master plan shows? Merkle and associates based their maps on the City's MSCP or MHP. Judy replied that she did not send out the Natural Resources Management Plan for Mission Bay Park; there was just too much information. She suggested asking for a copy from the Park & Recreation Department-Park Planning Division. There's a compilation of two reports on one CD: Mission Bay Park Master Plan Update and the Natural Resources Management Plan.

Hiram Sarabia noted that there's a lot of agencies digitally converting their reports and posting them together with mapping coordinates, and maybe this report can be included.

Future Meetings

- Friday, Dec 9, 2005
- Friday, Jan 13, 2006
- Friday, Feb 10, 2006
- Friday, Mar 10, 2006
- Friday, Apr 7, 2006 *Subject to change
- Friday, May 12, 2006
- Friday, June 16, 2006 *Subject to change